The fact that among the Commissioners are doctors, magistrates, parsons, and a sheriff, makes the prospect for love, law, and physio in the "sane" world all the less promising. Ironically, given the likelihood that the Editor is Workman, he remarks that his publication is not "the organ of the Asylum." Workman's subsequent numerous Annual Reports would be just that, a veritable Asylum newspaper often containing astonishingly effective journalism, especially for a bureaucratically driven governmental report.

On December 1, 1848, he requests more information on the dispute between Park and the Commissioners, but especially for more candour from the latter. The Editor does, however, make one observation or rather insinuation prejudicial to the interests of Dr. Roaf, which is that his son-in-law (Dr. Scott) appears to have been a candidate for Dr. Park's job and indeed a rival, in which case Rev. Roaf's present opposition to Dr. Park cannot appear unbiased or unmotivated.

By the issue of December 8, he feels that matters between Park and the Commissioners have deteriorated so far that the Executive has to get involved to bring about a peace. They must either find him guilty and punish him, or find him innocent and clear his name.

According to the Editor, it is hardly surprising that the leader of the "movement" against Dr. Park is the Rev. Dr. Roaf:

> Mr. Roaf is a man of great business tact, and very fond of enacting the part of top-sawyer, wherever he chances to have an opportunity of shewing off.

Roaf was evidently also something of an anti-Catholic bigot, since the Editor recalls a "no popery" speech which he delivered in London before "an exclusive audience." Apparently Roaf behaved more moderately at home, trying to reassure the Irish and to keep Dr. Burns quiet about "certain little matters of arrangement touching the University Bill." Given Roaf's record of deviousness, the Editor is skeptical that the Reverend Doctor has been "actuated by a mere sense of public duty."